

RESEARCH

Open Access

On the property of T -distributivity

Mücahide Nesibe Kesicioğlu*

*Correspondence:
m.nesibe@gmail.com
Department of Mathematics, Recep
Tayyip Erdoğan University, Rize,
53100, Turkey

Abstract

In this paper, we introduce the notion of T -distributivity for any t -norm on a bounded lattice. We determine a relation between the t -norms T and T' , where T' is a T -distributive t -norm. Also, for an arbitrary t -norm T , we give a necessary and sufficient condition for T_D to be T -distributive and for T to be T_\wedge -distributive. Moreover, we investigate the relation between the T -distributivity and the concepts of the T -partial order, the divisibility of t -norms. We also determine that the T -distributivity is preserved under the isomorphism. Finally, we construct a family of t -norms which are not distributive over each other with the help of incomparable elements in a bounded lattice.

MSC: 03B52; 03E72

Keywords: triangular norm; bounded lattice; T -partial order; divisibility; distributivity

1 Introduction

Triangular norms based on a notion used by Menger [1] were introduced by Schweizer and Sklar [2] in the framework of probabilistic metric spaces, and they play a fundamental role in several branches of mathematics like in fuzzy logics and their applications [3, 4], the games theory [5], the non-additive measures and integral theory [6–8].

A triangular norm (t -norm for short) $T : [0, 1]^2 \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is a commutative, associative, non-decreasing operation on $[0, 1]$ with a neutral element 1. The four basic t -norms on $[0, 1]$ are the minimum T_M , the product T_P , the Łukasiewicz t -norm T_L and the drastic product T_D given by, respectively, $T_M(x, y) = \min(x, y)$, $T_P(x, y) = xy$, $T_L(x, y) = \max(0, x + y - 1)$ and

$$T_D(x, y) = \begin{cases} x, & \text{if } y = 1, \\ y, & \text{if } x = 1, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Recall that for any t -norms T_1 and T_2 , T_1 is called weaker than T_2 if for every $(x, y) \in [0, 1]^2$, $T_1(x, y) \leq T_2(x, y)$.

T -norms are defined on a bounded lattice $(L, \leq, 0, 1)$ in a similar way, and then extremal t -norms T_D as well as T_\wedge on L are defined similarly T_D and T_M on $[0, 1]$. For more details on t -norms on bounded lattices, we refer to [9–17]. Also, the order between t -norms on a bounded lattice is defined similarly.

In the present paper, we introduce the notion of T -distributivity for any t -norms on a bounded lattice $(L, \leq, 0, 1)$. The aim of this study is to discuss the properties of

T -distributivity. The paper is organized as follows. Firstly, we recall some basic notions in Section 2. In Section 3, we define the T -distributivity for any t -norm on a bounded lattice. For any two t -norms T_1 and T_2 , where T_1 is T_2 -distributive, we show that T_1 is weaker than T_2 and give an example illustrating the converse of this need not be true. Also, we prove that the only t -norm T , where every t -norm is T -distributive, is the infimum t -norm T_\wedge when the lattice L is especially a chain. If L is not a chain, we give an example illustrating any t -norm need not be T_\wedge . Also, we show that for any t -norm T on a bounded lattice, T_D is T -distributive. Moreover, we show that the T -distributivity is preserved under the isomorphism. For any two t -norms T_1 and T_2 such that T_1 is T_2 -distributive, we prove that the divisibility of t -norm T_1 requires the divisibility of t -norm T_2 . Also, we obtain that for any two t -norms T_1 and T_2 , where T_1 is T_2 -distributive, the T_1 -partial order implies T_2 -partial order. Finally, we construct a family of t -norms which are not distributive over each other with the help of incomparable elements in a bounded lattice.

2 Notations, definitions and a review of previous results

Definition 1 [14] Let $(L, \leq, 0, 1)$ be a bounded lattice. A triangular norm T (t -norm for short) is a binary operation on L which is commutative, associative, monotone and has a neutral element 1.

Let

$$T_D(x, y) = \begin{cases} x, & \text{if } y = 1, \\ y, & \text{if } x = 1, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then T_D is a t -norm on L . Since it holds that $T_D \leq T$ for any t -norm T on L , T_D is the smallest t -norm on L .

The largest t -norm on a bounded lattice $(L, \leq, 0, 1)$ is given by $T_\wedge(x, y) = x \wedge y$.

Definition 2 [18] A t -norm T on L is divisible if the following condition holds:

$$\forall x, y \in L \text{ with } x \leq y, \text{ there is a } z \in L \text{ such that } x = T(y, z).$$

A basic example of a non-divisible t -norm on any bounded lattice (*i.e.*, $\text{card } L > 2$) is the weakest t -norm T_D . Trivially, the infimum T_\wedge is divisible: $x \leq y$ is equivalent to $x \wedge y = x$.

Definition 3 [12] Let L be a bounded lattice, T be a t -norm on L . The order defined as follows is called a T -partial order (triangular order) for a t -norm T .

$$x \leq_T y : \Leftrightarrow T(\ell, y) = x \text{ for some } \ell \in L.$$


Definition 4 [19]

(i) A t -norm T on a lattice L is called \wedge -distributive if

$$T(a, b_1 \wedge b_2) = T(a, b_1) \wedge T(a, b_2)$$

for every $a, b_1, b_2 \in L$.

Figure 1 $(L = \{0, a, b, c, 1\}, \leq, 0, 1)$.



(ii) A t -norm T on a complete lattice $(L, \leq, 0, 1)$ is called *infinitely \wedge -distributive* if

$$T(a, \bigwedge_I b_\tau) = \bigwedge_I T(a, b_\tau)$$

for every subset $\{a, b_\tau \in L, \tau \in I\}$ of L .

3 T -distributivity

Definition 5 Let $(L, \leq, 0, 1)$ be a bounded lattice and T_1 and T_2 be two t -norms on L . For every $x, y, z \in L$ such that at least one of the elements y, z is not 1, if the condition

$$T_1(x, T_2(y, z)) = T_2(T_1(x, y), T_1(x, z))$$

is satisfied, then T_1 is called T_2 -distributive or we say that T_1 is distributive over T_2 .

Example 1 Let $(L = \{0, a, b, c, 1\}, \leq, 0, 1)$ be a bounded lattice whose lattice diagram is displayed in Figure 1.

The functions T_1 and T_2 on the lattice L defined by

$$T_1(x, y) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } x = a, y = a, \\ b, & \text{if } x = c, y = c, \\ x \wedge y, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

and

$$T_2(x, y) = \begin{cases} b, & \text{if } x = c, y = c, \\ x \wedge y, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

are obviously t -norms on L such that T_1 is T_2 -distributive.

Proposition 1 Let $(L, \leq, 0, 1)$ be a bounded lattice and T_1 and T_2 be two t -norms on L . If T_1 is T_2 -distributive, then T_1 is weaker than T_2 .

Proof Since all t -norms coincide on the boundary of L^2 , it is sufficient to show that $T_1 \leq T_2$ for all $x, y, z \in L \setminus \{0, 1\}$. By the T_2 -distributivity of T_1 , it is obtained that

$$T_1(x, y) = T_1(T_2(x, 1), y) = T_2(T_1(x, y), T_1(1, y)) = T_2(T_1(x, y), y) \leq T_2(x, y).$$

Thus, $T_1 \leq T_2$, i.e., T_1 is weaker than T_2 . □

Remark 1 The converse of Proposition 1 need not be true. Namely, for any two t -norms T_1 and T_2 , even if T_1 is weaker than T_2 , T_1 may not be T_2 -distributive. Now, let us investigate the following example.

Example 2 Consider the product T_P and the Łukasiewicz t -norm T_L . It is clear that $T_L < T_P$. Since

$$T_L\left(\frac{3}{4}, T_P\left(\frac{5}{8}, \frac{1}{2}\right)\right) = T_L\left(\frac{3}{4}, \frac{5}{16}\right) = \frac{1}{16}$$

and

$$T_P\left(T_L\left(\frac{3}{4}, \frac{5}{8}\right), T_L\left(\frac{3}{4}, \frac{1}{2}\right)\right) = T_P\left(\frac{3}{8}, \frac{1}{4}\right) = \frac{3}{32}$$

T_L is not T_P -distributive.

Corollary 1 Let L be a bounded lattice and T_1 and T_2 be any two t -norms on L . If both T_1 is T_2 -distributive and T_2 is T_1 -distributive, then $T_1 = T_2$.

Proposition 2 Let L be a bounded chain and T' be a t -norm on L . For every t -norm T , T is T' -distributive if and only if $T' = T_\wedge$.

Proof \Rightarrow Let T be an arbitrary t -norm on L such that T' -distributive. By Proposition 1, it is obvious that $T \leq T'$ for any t -norm T . Thus, $T' = T_\wedge$.

\Leftarrow : Since L is a chain, for any $y, z \in L$, either $y \leq z$ or $z \leq y$. Suppose that $y \leq z$. By using the monotonicity of any t -norm T , it is obtained that for any $x \in L$, $T(x, y) \leq T(x, z)$. Then

$$T(x, y) = T(x, y) \wedge T(x, z)$$

holds. Thus, for any $x, y, z \in L$,

$$\begin{aligned} T(x, T_\wedge(y, z)) &= T(x, y) \\ &= T(x, y) \wedge T(x, z) \\ &= T_\wedge(T(x, y), T(x, z)) \end{aligned}$$

is satisfied, which shows that any t -norm T is T_\wedge -distributive. \square

Remark 2 In Proposition 2, if L is not a chain, then the left-hand side of Proposition 2 may not be satisfied. Namely, if L is not a chain, then any t -norm T need not be T_\wedge -distributive. Moreover, even if L is a distributive lattice, any t -norm on L may not be T_\wedge -distributive. Now, let us investigate the following example.

Example 3 Consider the lattice $(L = \{0, x, y, z, a, 1\}, \leq)$ as displayed in Figure 2.

Obviously, L is a distributive lattice. Define the function T on L as shown in Table 1.

One can easily check that T is a t -norm. Since

$$T(a, T_\wedge(y, z)) = T(a, x) = 0$$

Figure 2 $(L = \{0, x, y, z, a, 1\}, \leq)$.




Table 1 T -norm on the lattice $(L = \{0, x, y, z, a, 1\}, \leq)$

T	0	x	y	z	a	1
0	0	0	0	0	0	0
x	0	0	0	0	0	x
y	0	0	y	0	y	y
z	0	0	0	z	z	z
a	0	0	y	z	a	a
1	0	x	y	z	a	1

and

$$T_{\wedge}(T(a, y), T(a, z)) = T_{\wedge}(y, z) = x,$$

T is not T_{\wedge} -distributive.

Remark 3 The fact that any t -norm T is T_{\wedge} -distributive means that T is \wedge -distributive.

Theorem 1 Let $(L, \leq, 0, 1)$ be a bounded lattice. For any t -norm T on L , T_D is T -distributive.

Proof Let T be an arbitrary t -norm on L . We must show that the equality

$$T_D(x, T(y, z)) = T(T_D(x, y), T_D(x, z))$$

holds for every element x, y, z of L with $y \neq 1$ or $z \neq 1$. Suppose that $z \neq 1$. If $x = 1$, the desired equality holds since $T_D(x, T(y, z)) = T(y, z)$ and $T(T_D(x, y), T_D(x, z)) = T(y, z)$. Let $x \neq 1$. Then $y = 1$ or $y \neq 1$. If $y = 1$, since $T_D(x, T(y, z)) = T_D(x, z) = 0$ and $T(T_D(x, y), T_D(x, z)) = T(x, 0) = 0$, the equality holds again. Now, let $y \neq 1$. Since $T(y, z) \leq y \leq 1$ and $y \neq 1$, $T(y, z) \neq 1$. Then $T_D(x, T(y, z)) = 0$ and $T(T_D(x, y), T_D(x, z)) = T(0, 0) = 0$, whence the equality holds. Thus, T_D is T -distributive for any t -norm T on L . \square

Proposition 3 [20] If T is a t -norm and $\varphi : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is a strictly increasing bijection, then the operation $T_{\varphi} : [0, 1]^2 \rightarrow [0, 1]$ given by

$$T_{\varphi}(x, y) = \varphi^{-1}(T(\varphi(x), \varphi(y)))$$

is a t -norm which is isomorphic to T . This t -norm is called φ -transform of T .

Let T_1 and T_2 be any two t -norms on $[0, 1]$ and let φ be a strictly increasing bijection from $[0, 1]$ to $[0, 1]$. Denote the φ -transforms of the t -norms T_1 and T_2 by T_φ^1 and T_φ^2 , respectively.

Theorem 2 *Let T_1 and T_2 be any t -norms on $[0, 1]$ and let φ be a strictly increasing bijection from $[0, 1]$ to $[0, 1]$. T_1 is T_2 -distributive if and only if T_φ^1 is T_φ^2 -distributive.*

Proof Let T_1 be T_2 -distributive. We must show that for every $x, y, z \in [0, 1]$ with $y \neq 1$ or $z \neq 1$,

$$T_\varphi^1(x, T_\varphi^2(y, z)) = T_\varphi^2(T_\varphi^1(x, y), T_\varphi^1(x, z)).$$

Since $\varphi : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is a strictly increasing bijection, for every element $y, z \in [0, 1]$ with $y \neq 1$ or $z \neq 1$, it must be $\varphi(y) \neq 1$ or $\varphi(z) \neq 1$. By using T_2 -distributivity of T_1 , we obtain that the equality

$$\begin{aligned} T_\varphi^1(x, T_\varphi^2(y, z)) &= \varphi^{-1}(T_1(\varphi(x), \varphi(T_\varphi^2(y, z)))) \\ &= \varphi^{-1}(T_1(\varphi(x), \varphi(\varphi^{-1}(T_2(\varphi(y), \varphi(z))))) \\ &= \varphi^{-1}(T_1(\varphi(x), T_2(\varphi(y), \varphi(z)))) \\ &= \varphi^{-1}(T_2(T_1(\varphi(x), \varphi(y)), T_1(\varphi(x), \varphi(z)))) \\ &= \varphi^{-1}(T_2((\varphi \circ \varphi^{-1})T_1(\varphi(x), \varphi(y)), (\varphi \circ \varphi^{-1})T_1(\varphi(x), \varphi(z)))) \\ &= \varphi^{-1}(T_2(\varphi(\varphi^{-1}(T_1(\varphi(x), \varphi(y))))), \varphi(\varphi^{-1}(T_1(\varphi(x), \varphi(z))))) \\ &= \varphi^{-1}(T_2(\varphi(T_\varphi^1(x, y))), \varphi(T_\varphi^1(x, z))) \\ &= T_\varphi^2(T_\varphi^1(x, y), T_\varphi^1(x, z)) \end{aligned}$$

holds. Thus, T_φ^1 is T_φ^2 -distributive.

Conversely, let T_φ^1 be T_φ^2 -distributive. We will show that $T_1(x, T_2(y, z)) = T_2(T_1(x, y), T_1(x, z))$ for every element $x, y, z \in [0, 1]$ with $y \neq 1$ or $z \neq 1$. Since T_φ^1 is the φ -transform of the t -norm T_1 , for every $x, y \in [0, 1]$, $T_\varphi^1(x, y) = \varphi^{-1}(T_1(\varphi(x), \varphi(y)))$. Since φ is a bijection, it is clear that

$$T_1(\varphi(x), \varphi(y)) = \varphi(T_\varphi^1(x, y)) \quad (1)$$

holds. Also, by using (1), it is obtained that

$$T_1(x, y) = T_1(\varphi(\varphi^{-1}(x)), \varphi(\varphi^{-1}(y))) = \varphi(T_\varphi^1(\varphi^{-1}(x), \varphi^{-1}(y))) \quad (2)$$

From (2), it follows

$$T_\varphi^1(\varphi^{-1}(x), \varphi^{-1}(y)) = \varphi^{-1}(T_1(x, y)). \quad (3)$$

Also, the similar equalities for t -norm T_2 can be written. Since $\varphi^{-1}(y) \neq 1$ or $\varphi^{-1}(z) \neq 1$ for every $y, z \in [0, 1]$ with $y \neq 1$ or $z \neq 1$, by using T_φ^2 -distributivity of T_φ^1 , it is obtained that the

following equalities:

$$\begin{aligned}
 T_1(x, T_2(y, z)) &\stackrel{(2)}{=} T_1(x, \varphi(T_\varphi^2(\varphi^{-1}(y), \varphi^{-1}(z)))) \\
 &\stackrel{(2)}{=} \varphi(T_\varphi^1(\varphi^{-1}(x), \varphi^{-1}(\varphi(T_\varphi^2(\varphi^{-1}(y), \varphi^{-1}(z)))))) \\
 &= \varphi(T_\varphi^1(\varphi^{-1}(x), T_\varphi^2(\varphi^{-1}(y), \varphi^{-1}(z)))) \\
 &= \varphi(T_\varphi^2(T_\varphi^1(\varphi^{-1}(x), \varphi^{-1}(y)), T_\varphi^1(\varphi^{-1}(x), \varphi^{-1}(z)))) \\
 &\stackrel{(3)}{=} \varphi(T_\varphi^2(\varphi^{-1}(T_1(x, y)), \varphi^{-1}(T_1(x, z)))) \\
 &\stackrel{(2)}{=} \varphi(\varphi^{-1}(T_2(T_1(x, y), T_1(x, z)))) \\
 &= T_2(T_1(x, y), T_1(x, z))
 \end{aligned}$$

hold. Thus, T_1 is T_2 -distributive. \square

Proposition 4 Let $(L, \leq, 0, 1)$ be a bounded lattice and T_1 and T_2 be two t -norms on L such that T_1 is T_2 -distributive. If T_1 is divisible, then T_2 is also divisible.

Proof Consider two elements x, y of L with $x \leq y$. If $x = y$, then T_2 would be always a divisible t -norm since $T_2(y, 1) = y = x$. Let $x \neq y$. Since T_1 is divisible, there exists an element $1 \neq z$ of L such that $T_1(y, z) = x$. Then, by using T_2 -distributivity of T_1 , it is obtained that

$$\begin{aligned}
 x &= T_1(y, z) = T_1(y, T_2(z, 1)) \\
 &= T_2(T_1(y, z), T_1(y, 1)) \\
 &= T_2(T_1(y, z), y).
 \end{aligned}$$

Thus, for any elements x, y of L with $x \leq y$ and $x \neq y$, since there exists an element $T_1(y, z) \in L$ such that $x = T_2(T_1(y, z), y)$, T_2 is a divisible t -norm. \square

Corollary 2 Let $(L, \leq, 0, 1)$ be a bounded lattice and T_1 and T_2 be two t -norms on L . If T_1 is T_2 -distributive, then the T_1 -partial order implies the T_2 -partial order.

Proof Let $a \leq_{T_1} b$ for any $a, b \in L$. If $a = b$, then it would be $a \leq_{T_2} b$ since $T_2(b, 1) = b = a$ for the element $1 \in L$. Now, suppose that $a \leq_{T_1} b$ but $a \neq b$. Then there exists an element $\ell \in L$ such that $T_1(b, \ell) = a$. Since $a \neq b$, it must be $\ell \neq 1$. Then $T_1(b, T_2(\ell, 1)) = T_1(b, \ell) = a$. Since T_1 is T_2 -distributive, it is obtained that

$$\begin{aligned}
 a &= T_1(b, T_2(\ell, 1)) = T_2(T_1(b, \ell), T_1(b, 1)) \\
 &= T_2(a, b).
 \end{aligned}$$

for elements $b, \ell, 1 \in L$ with $\ell \neq 1$, whence $a \leq_{T_2} b$. So, we obtain that $\leq_{T_1} \subseteq \leq_{T_2}$. \square

Remark 4 For any t -norms T_1 and T_2 , if T_1 is T_2 -distributive, then we show that T_1 is weaker than T_2 in Proposition 1 and the T_1 -partial order implies the T_2 -partial order in Proposition 2. Although T_1 is weaker than T_2 , that does not require the T_1 -partial order to imply the T_2 -partial order. Let us investigate the following example illustrating this case.

Example 4 Consider the drastic product T_P and the function defined as follows:

$$T^*(x, y) = \begin{cases} xy, & \text{if } (x, y) \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]^2, \\ \min(x, y), & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

It is clear that the function T^* is a t -norm such that $T_P \leq T^*$, but $\leq_{T_P} \not\leq_{T^*}$. Indeed.

First, let us show that $\frac{3}{8} \not\leq_{T^*} \frac{1}{2}$. Suppose that $\frac{3}{8} \leq_{T^*} \frac{1}{2}$. Then, for some $\ell \in [0, 1]$,

$$T^*\left(\ell, \frac{1}{2}\right) = \frac{3}{8}.$$

For $\ell \in [0, 1]$, either $\ell \leq \frac{1}{2}$ or $\ell > \frac{1}{2}$. Let $\ell \leq \frac{1}{2}$. Since $\frac{3}{8} = T^*\left(\ell, \frac{1}{2}\right) = \frac{1}{2}\ell$, it is obtained that $\ell = \frac{3}{4}$, which contradicts $\ell \leq \frac{1}{2}$. Then it must be $\ell > \frac{1}{2}$. Since $\frac{3}{8} = T^*\left(\ell, \frac{1}{2}\right) = \min(\ell, \frac{1}{2}) = \frac{1}{2}$, which is a contradiction. Thus, it is obtained that $\frac{3}{8} \not\leq_{T^*} \frac{1}{2}$. On the other hand, since $x \leq_{T_P} y$ means that there exists an element ℓ of L such that $T_P(\ell, y) = \ell y = x$ and $T_P(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{4}) = \frac{3}{8}$, we have that $\frac{3}{8} \leq_{T_P} \frac{1}{2}$. So, it is obtained that $\leq_{T_P} \not\leq_{T^*}$.

Now, let us construct a family of t -norms which are not distributive over each other with the help of incomparable elements in a bounded lattice.

Theorem 3 Let L be a complete lattice and $\{S_\alpha | \alpha \in I\}$ be a nonempty family of nonempty sets consisting of the elements in L which are all incomparable to each other with respect to the order on L . If for any element $u \in S_\alpha$, $\inf\{u \wedge \mu_i | \mu_i \in S_\alpha\}$ is comparable to every element in L , then the family $(T_u)_{u \in S_\alpha}$ defined by

$$T_u(x, y) = \begin{cases} \inf\{u \wedge \mu_i | \mu_i \in S_\alpha\}, & \text{if } (x, y) \in [\inf\{u \wedge \mu_i | \mu_i \in S_\alpha\}, u]^2, \\ x \wedge y, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

is a family of t -norms which are not distributive over each other. Namely, for any $\ell, q \in S_\alpha$, neither T_ℓ is T_q -distributive nor T_q is T_ℓ -distributive.

Proof Firstly, let us show that for every $u \in S_\alpha$, each function T_u is a t -norm.

(i) Since $x \leq 1$, for every element $x \in L$, $1 \notin S_\alpha$. Then it follows $T_u(x, 1) = x \wedge 1 = x$ from $(x, 1) \notin [\inf\{u \wedge \mu_i | \mu_i \in S_\alpha\}, u]^2$, that is, the boundary condition is satisfied.

(ii) It can be easily shown that the commutativity holds.

(iii) Considering the monotonicity, suppose that $x \leq y$ for $x, y \in L$. Let $z \in L$ be arbitrary. Then there are the following possible conditions for the couples (x, z) , (y, z) .

- Let $(x, z), (y, z) \in [\inf\{u \wedge \mu_i | \mu_i \in S_\alpha\}, u]^2$. Then we get clearly the equality

$$T_u(x, z) = \inf\{u \wedge \mu_i | \mu_i \in S_\alpha\} = T_u(y, z).$$

- Let $(x, z) \in [\inf\{u \wedge \mu_i | \mu_i \in S_\alpha\}, u]^2$ and $(y, z) \notin [\inf\{u \wedge \mu_i | \mu_i \in S_\alpha\}, u]^2$. Then $y \notin [\inf\{u \wedge \mu_i | \mu_i \in S_\alpha\}, u]$. Clearly, $T_u(x, z) = \inf\{u \wedge \mu_i | \mu_i \in S_\alpha\}$ and $T_u(y, z) = y \wedge z$. Since $x \in [\inf\{u \wedge \mu_i | \mu_i \in S_\alpha\}, u]$ and $x \leq y$, we obtain $\inf\{u \wedge \mu_i | \mu_i \in S_\alpha\} \leq y$. By $\inf\{u \wedge \mu_i | \mu_i \in S_\alpha\} \leq z$, we get $\inf\{u \wedge \mu_i | \mu_i \in S_\alpha\} \leq y \wedge z$, whence $T_u(x, z) \leq T_u(y, z)$.

- Let $(x, z) \notin [\inf\{u \wedge \mu_i | \mu_i \in S_\alpha\}, u]^2$ and $(y, z) \in [\inf\{u \wedge \mu_i | \mu_i \in S_\alpha\}, u]^2$. Then it is clear that $x \notin [\inf\{u \wedge \mu_i | \mu_i \in S_\alpha\}, u]$. In this case,

$$T_u(x, z) = x \wedge z \quad \text{and} \quad T_u(y, z) = \inf\{u \wedge \mu_i | \mu_i \in S_\alpha\}.$$

By $x \leq y$ and $y \leq u$, it is clear that $x \leq u$. Since $\inf\{u \wedge \mu_i | \mu_i \in S_\alpha\}$ is comparable to every element in L , either $x \leq \inf\{u \wedge \mu_i | \mu_i \in S_\alpha\}$ or $\inf\{u \wedge \mu_i | \mu_i \in S_\alpha\} \leq x$. If $\inf\{u \wedge \mu_i | \mu_i \in S_\alpha\} \leq x$, it would be $x \in [\inf\{u \wedge \mu_i | \mu_i \in S_\alpha\}, u]$ from $x \leq u$, a contradiction. Thus, it must be $x \leq \inf\{u \wedge \mu_i | \mu_i \in S_\alpha\}$. Since $z \in [\inf\{u \wedge \mu_i | \mu_i \in S_\alpha\}, u]$, $x \wedge z = x$. Thus, the inequality

$$T_u(x, z) = x \wedge z = x \leq \inf\{u \wedge \mu_i | \mu_i \in S_\alpha\} = T_u(y, z)$$

holds.

- Let $(x, z), (y, z) \notin [\inf\{u \wedge \mu_i | \mu_i \in S_\alpha\}, u]^2$. By $x \leq y$, we have that

$$T_u(x, z) = x \wedge z \leq y \wedge z = T_u(y, z).$$

So, the monotonicity holds.

(iv) Now let us show that for every $x, y, z \in L$, the equality $T_u(x, T_u(y, z)) = T_u(T_u(x, y), z)$ holds.

- Let $(x, y), (y, z) \in [\inf\{u \wedge \mu_i | \mu_i \in S_\alpha\}, u]^2$. Then

$$T_u(x, T_u(y, z)) = \inf\{u \wedge \mu_i | \mu_i \in S_\alpha\}$$

and

$$T_u(T_u(x, y), z) = \inf\{u \wedge \mu_i | \mu_i \in S_\alpha\},$$

whence the equality holds.

- If $(x, y) \in [\inf\{u \wedge \mu_i | \mu_i \in S_\alpha\}, u]^2$ and $(y, z) \notin [\inf\{u \wedge \mu_i | \mu_i \in S_\alpha\}, u]^2$, then it must be $z \notin [\inf\{u \wedge \mu_i | \mu_i \in S_\alpha\}, u]$. Here, there are two choices for z : either $z \in S_\alpha$ or $z \notin S_\alpha$.

Let $z \in S_\alpha$. Then $\inf\{u \wedge \mu_i | \mu_i \in S_\alpha\} \leq z$. By the inequality $\inf\{u \wedge \mu_i | \mu_i \in S_\alpha\} \leq u$, it is clear that $\inf\{u \wedge \mu_i | \mu_i \in S_\alpha\} \leq u \wedge z$. Since $\inf\{u \wedge \mu_i | \mu_i \in S_\alpha\} \leq y \leq u$, the following inequalities:

$$\inf\{u \wedge \mu_i | \mu_i \in S_\alpha\} = \inf\{u \wedge \mu_i | \mu_i \in S_\alpha\} \wedge z \leq y \wedge z \leq y \leq u$$

hold, that is, $y \wedge z \in [\inf\{u \wedge \mu_i | \mu_i \in S_\alpha\}, u]$. Thus, we have that

$$T_u(x, T_u(y, z)) = T_u(x, y \wedge z) = \inf\{u \wedge \mu_i | \mu_i \in S_\alpha\}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} T_u(T_u(x, y), z) &= T_u(\inf\{u \wedge \mu_i | \mu_i \in S_\alpha\}, z) \\ &= \inf\{u \wedge \mu_i | \mu_i \in S_\alpha\} \wedge z = \inf\{u \wedge \mu_i | \mu_i \in S_\alpha\}. \end{aligned}$$

So, the equality holds again.

Let $z \notin S_\alpha$. Then there exists at least an element v in S_α such that v is comparable to the element z ; i.e., either $z \leq v$ or $v \leq z$. Let $v \leq z$. Since $u, v \in S_\alpha$, it is clear that $\inf\{u \wedge \mu_i | \mu_i \in S_\alpha\} \leq u \wedge v \leq u \wedge z \leq u$. Also, from the inequalities $\inf\{u \wedge \mu_i | \mu_i \in S_\alpha\} \leq y$ and $\inf\{u \wedge \mu_i | \mu_i \in S_\alpha\} \leq v \leq z$, it follows $\inf\{u \wedge \mu_i | \mu_i \in S_\alpha\} \leq y \wedge z \leq y \leq u$, i.e., it is obtained that $y \wedge z \in [\inf\{u \wedge \mu_i | \mu_i \in S_\alpha\}, u]$. Thus,

$$T_u(x, T_u(y, z)) = T_u(x, y \wedge z) = \inf\{u \wedge \mu_i | \mu_i \in S_\alpha\}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} T_u(T_u(x, y), z) &= T_u(\inf\{u \wedge \mu_i | \mu_i \in S_\alpha\}, z) \\ &= \inf\{u \wedge \mu_i | \mu_i \in S_\alpha\} \wedge z \\ &= \inf\{u \wedge \mu_i | \mu_i \in S_\alpha\}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, the equality is satisfied.

Now, suppose that $z \leq v$. If $u \leq z$, it would be $u \leq v$, which is a contradiction. Thus, either $z < u$ or z and u are not comparable. If $z < u$, then it must be $z < \inf\{u \wedge \mu_i | \mu_i \in S_\alpha\}$ since $\inf\{u \wedge \mu_i | \mu_i \in S_\alpha\}$ is comparable to every element in L and $z \notin [\inf\{u \wedge \mu_i | \mu_i \in S_\alpha\}, u]$. Thus, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} T_u(T_u(x, y), z) &= T_u(\inf\{u \wedge \mu_i | \mu_i \in S_\alpha\}, z) \\ &= \inf\{u \wedge \mu_i | \mu_i \in S_\alpha\} \wedge z \\ &= z \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} T_u(x, T_u(y, z)) &= T_u(x, y \wedge z) \\ &= T_u(x, z) \\ &= x \wedge z = z, \end{aligned}$$

whence the equality holds.

Let z and u be not comparable. Since $\inf\{u \wedge \mu_i | \mu_i \in S_\alpha\}$ is comparable to every element in L , either $\inf\{u \wedge \mu_i | \mu_i \in S_\alpha\} < z$ or $\inf\{u \wedge \mu_i | \mu_i \in S_\alpha\} > z$. If $\inf\{u \wedge \mu_i | \mu_i \in S_\alpha\} > z$, it would be $z < u$, a contradiction. Then it must be $\inf\{u \wedge \mu_i | \mu_i \in S_\alpha\} < z$. By $\inf\{u \wedge \mu_i | \mu_i \in S_\alpha\} = \inf\{u \wedge \mu_i | \mu_i \in S_\alpha\} \wedge y < y \wedge z < y < u$, it is obtained that $y \wedge z \in [\inf\{u \wedge \mu_i | \mu_i \in S_\alpha\}, u]$. Then the equalities

$$T_u(x, T_u(y, z)) = T_u(x, y \wedge z) = \inf\{u \wedge \mu_i | \mu_i \in S_\alpha\}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} T_u(T_u(x, y), z) &= T_u(\inf\{u \wedge \mu_i | \mu_i \in S_\alpha\}, z) \\ &= \inf\{u \wedge \mu_i | \mu_i \in S_\alpha\} \wedge z = \inf\{u \wedge \mu_i | \mu_i \in S_\alpha\}. \end{aligned}$$

In this case, the equality is satisfied.

Similarly, one can show that the equality $T_u(x, T_u(y, z)) = T_u(T_u(x, y), z)$ holds when $(x, y) \notin [\inf\{u \wedge \mu_i | \mu_i \in S_\alpha\}, u]^2$ and $(y, z) \in [\inf\{u \wedge \mu_i | \mu_i \in S_\alpha\}, u]^2$.

- Now, let us investigate the last condition. If $(x, y), (y, z) \notin [\inf\{u \wedge \mu_i | \mu_i \in S_\alpha\}, u]^2$, then it is obvious that

$$T_u(x, T_u(y, z)) = T_u(x, y \wedge z) = x \wedge (y \wedge z)$$

and

$$T_u(T_u(x, y), z) = T_u(x \wedge y, z) = (x \wedge y) \wedge z,$$

whence the equality holds.

Consequently, we prove that $(T_u)_{u \in S_\alpha}$ is a family of t -norms on L . Now, we will show that for every $m, n \in S_\alpha$, T_m and T_n are not distributive t -norms over each other.

Suppose that T_m is T_n -distributive. By Proposition 1, it must be $T_m \leq T_n$, that is, for every $x, y \in L$, $T_m(x, y) \leq T_n(x, y)$. Since m and n are not comparable, it is clear that $n \not\leq m$ and $m \not\leq n$. Then n must not be in $[\inf\{m \wedge \mu_i | \mu_i \in S_\alpha\}, m]$. Thus,

$$T_m(n, n) = n \wedge n = n.$$

On the other hand, since $n \in [\inf\{n \wedge \mu_i | \mu_i \in S_\alpha\}, n]$,

$$T_n(n, n) = \inf\{n \wedge \mu_i | \mu_i \in S_\alpha\}.$$

Then we have that $T_n(n, n) \neq T_m(n, n)$. Otherwise, we obtain that $n \leq m$, which is a contradiction. So, we have that $T_n(n, n) < T_m(n, n)$ contradicts $T_m \leq T_n$. Thus, T_m is not T_n -distributive. Similarly, it can be shown that T_n is not T_m -distributive. So, the family given above is a family of t -norms which are not distributive over each other. \square

To explain how the family $(S_\alpha)_{\alpha \in I}$ in Theorem 3 can be determined, let us investigate the following example.

Example 5 Let $(L = \{0, a, b, c, d, e, 1\}, \leq, 0, 1)$ be a bounded lattice as shown in Figure 3.

For the family of $(S_\alpha)_{\alpha \in I}$, there are two choices: one of them must be $S_{\alpha_1} = \{c, d, e\}$ and the other must be $S_{\alpha_2} = \{b, e\}$. Then, by Theorem 3, for every $u \in S_{\alpha_1}$ and $v \in S_{\alpha_2}$, the following

Figure 3 $(L = \{0, a, b, c, d, e, 1\}, \leq, 0, 1)$.





Figure 4 $(L = \{0, a, b, c, d, e, f, g, h, j, 1\}, \leq, 0, 1)$.



functions:

$$T_u(x, y) = \begin{cases} a, & \text{if } (x, y) \in [a, u]^2, \\ x \wedge y, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

and

$$T_v(x, y) = \begin{cases} a, & \text{if } (x, y) \in [a, v]^2, \\ x \wedge y, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

are two families of t -norms.

Remark 5 In Theorem 3, if the condition that $\inf\{u \wedge \mu_i \mid \mu_i \in S_\alpha\}$ is comparable to every element in L is canceled, then for any element $u \in S_\alpha$, T_u is not a t -norm. The following is an example showing that T_u is not a t -norm when the condition that for any element $u \in S_\alpha$, $\inf\{u \wedge \mu_i \mid \mu_i \in S_\alpha\}$ is comparable to every element in L is canceled.

Example 6 Let $(L = \{0, a, b, c, d, e, f, g, h, j, 1\}, \leq, 0, 1)$ be a bounded lattice as displayed in Figure 4.

From Figure 4, it is clear that $\inf\{j, e, f\} = a$ is not comparable to b . However, for the set $S = \{j, e, f\}$, the function defined by

$$T_e(x, y) = \begin{cases} a, & \text{if } (x, y) \in [a, e]^2, \\ x \wedge y, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

does not satisfy the associativity since $T_e(T_e(c, d), b) = 0$ and $T_e(c, T_e(d, b)) = b$. So, T_e is not a t -norm.

4 Conclusions

In this paper, we introduced the notion of T -distributivity for any t -norm on a bounded lattice and discussed some properties of T -distributivity. We determined a necessary and sufficient condition for T_D to be T -distributive and for T to be T_\wedge -distributive. We obtained that T -distributivity is preserved under the isomorphism. We proved that the divisibility of t -norm T_1 requires the divisibility of t -norm T_2 for any two t -norms T_1 and

T_2 where T_1 is T_2 -distributive. Also, we constructed a family of t -norms which are not distributive over each other with the help of incomparable elements in a bounded lattice.

Competing interests

The author declares that they have no competing interests.

Acknowledgements

Dedicated to Professor Hari M Srivastava.

Received: 4 December 2012 Accepted: 31 January 2013 Published: 15 February 2013

References

- Menger, K: Statistical metrics. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **28**, 535-537 (1942)
- Schweizer, B, Sklar, A: *Probabilistic Metric Spaces*. Elsevier, Amsterdam (1983)
- Höhle, U: Commutative: residuated ℓ -monoids. In: Höhle, U, Klement, EP (eds.) *Non-Classical Logics and Their Applications to Fuzzy Subsets: a Handbook on the Math., Foundations of Fuzzy Set Theory*. Kluwer Academic, Dordrecht (1995)
- Liang, X, Pedrycz, W: Logic-based fuzzy networks: a study in system modeling with triangular norms and uninorms. *Fuzzy Sets Syst.* **160**, 3475-3502 (2009)
- Butnariu, D, Klement, EP: *Triangular Norm-Based Measures and Games with Fuzzy Coalitions*. Kluwer Academic, Dordrecht (1993)
- Klement, EP, Mesiar, R, Pap, E: Integration with respect to decomposable measures, based on a conditionally distributive semiring on the unit interval. *Int. J. Uncertain. Fuzziness Knowl.-Based Syst.* **8**, 701-717 (2000)
- Klement, EP, Weber, S: An integral representation for decomposable measures of measurable functions. *Aequ. Math.* **47**, 255-262 (1994)
- Kolesárová, A: On the integral representation of possibility measures of fuzzy events. *J. Fuzzy Math.* **5**, 759-766 (1997)
- Birkhoff, G: *Lattice Theory*, 3rd edn. Am. Math. Soc., Providence (1967)
- De Baets, B, Mesiar, R: Triangular norms on product lattices. *Fuzzy Sets Syst.* **104**, 61-75 (1999)
- Jenei, S, De Baets, B: On the direct decomposability of t -norms on product lattices. *Fuzzy Sets Syst.* **139**, 699-707 (2003)
- Karaçal, F, Kesicioğlu, MN: A T -partial order obtained from t -norms. *Kybernetika* **47**, 300-314 (2011)
- Karaçal, F, Sağiroğlu, Y: Infinitely \bigvee -distributive t -norm on complete lattices and pseudo-complements. *Fuzzy Sets Syst.* **160**, 32-43 (2009)
- Karaçal, F, Khadjiev, D: \bigvee -distributive and infinitely \bigvee -distributive t -norms on complete lattice. *Fuzzy Sets Syst.* **151**, 341-352 (2005)
- Karaçal, F: On the direct decomposability of strong negations and S -implication operators on product lattices. *Inf. Sci.* **176**, 3011-3025 (2006)
- Saminger, S: On ordinal sums of triangular norms on bounded lattices. *Fuzzy Sets Syst.* **157**, 1403-1416 (2006)
- Saminger-Platz, S, Klement, EP, Mesiar, R: On extensions of triangular norms on bounded lattices. *Indag. Math.* **19**, 135-150 (2009)
- Casasnovas, J, Mayor, G: Discrete t -norms and operations on extended multisets. *Fuzzy Sets Syst.* **159**, 1165-1177 (2008)
- Wang, Z, Yu, Y: Pseudo t -norms and implication operators: direct product and direct product decompositions. *Fuzzy Sets Syst.* **139**, 673-683 (2003)
- Klement, EP, Mesiar, R, Pap, E: *Triangular Norms*. Kluwer Academic, Dordrecht (2000)

doi:10.1186/1687-1812-2013-32

Cite this article as: Kesicioğlu: On the property of T -distributivity. *Fixed Point Theory and Applications* 2013 **2013**:32.

Submit your manuscript to a SpringerOpen[®] journal and benefit from:

- Convenient online submission
- Rigorous peer review
- Immediate publication on acceptance
- Open access: articles freely available online
- High visibility within the field
- Retaining the copyright to your article

Submit your next manuscript at ► springeropen.com